

State of Oklahoma that have influenced my political life, Ada Lois Sipuel Fisher and Helen Cole.

Madam Speaker, Ada Lois Sipuel Fisher was born in Chickasha, OK, to parents only one generation removed from slavery. She received her bachelor's degree from Langston University and then in 1946, applied to the all-white University of Oklahoma law school. Because Oklahoma had no separate law school for blacks, she contended, the State's official policy of separate but equal education was illusory. Her simple request for an equal education sparked controversy across the country.

Ada Lois Sipuel Fisher was a strong woman who endured many trying times and eventually triumphed. Her effort to enroll in the University of Oklahoma in January 1946, would take Thurgood Marshall and more than three years and two trips to the Supreme Court. Ms. Fisher carried herself with dignity throughout the entire ordeal. Her patience and courage eventually won the support of thousands of Oklahomans, including the university president, and it also won justice for her and thousands of others who would follow in her footsteps.

Ada Lois Sipuel Fisher graduated from law school in 1951, earned a masters in history in 1968, and then spent many years as a professor and chair of social sciences at Langston University. In 1992, in recognition of her lifetime of serving, she was appointed a member of the board of regents of the university of Oklahoma.

The Sipuel Case was a legal landmark which pointed the way to the elimination of segregation in all of American public education. This woman's strength and positive attitude made Oklahoma a better State, and it made the United States a better nation.

Another dynamic Oklahoman is State senator, Helen Cole. Helen Cole is a native Oklahoman who has spent her career dedicated to helping others through public service in Oklahoma. She served in a variety of political offices including the State Republican Committee, Cleveland County precinct judge, and the State House of Representatives.

Throughout her life as a public servant, Helen Cole has championed many cases. She is deeply concerned with the drug problem in America and works to educate people through Alcohol and Drug Centers. She is also involved in promoting ethics in government and belongs to the League of Women voters where she strives to encourage others to take an active role in government.

In addition to her public achievements, Senator Cole is a wife and a mother. She is as dedicated to her family as she is in her service to our great State. She has been a rock of Gibraltar in difficult times for many, she has been a friend to me, a consultant, and a prayer partner. She has truly been a shining star. Mr. Speaker, it gives me

great honor to recognize Ada Lois Sipuel Fisher and Helen Cole today. They are women who represent great integrity and principle—women we Oklahomans are proud to call our own.

□ 2130

CHANGE IN ORDER OF TAKING SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SEASTRAND). The gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the gentlewoman from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ON ARMS TRANSFER TO PAKISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to the impending shipment of United States arms to Pakistan. The administration proposes shipping 368 million dollar's worth of conventional arms to Pakistan, despite the recent revelations that Pakistan received nuclear technology from China last year. While I have often come to well of the House to defend this administration's foreign policy, in this case I must express my complete opposition to the direction that we are going by in providing sophisticated and de-stabilizing weapons to Pakistan, a country that has repeatedly broken their assurances to us about their nuclear weapons development and acquisition intentions.

A provision in the Foreign Operations appropriations legislation that finally became law earlier this year would authorize the transfer of \$368 million in sophisticated conventional weaponry, including three Navy P-3C antisubmarine aircraft, 28 Harpoon missiles, 360 AIM-9L missiles, and other Army and Air Force equipment. This provision, known as the Brown amendment, after its Senate sponsor, passed the Senate last year. Although the provision was never debated in the House, it carried in conference. I drafted a letter to the conferees, which was signed by 40 other Members from both sides of the aisle urging that this provision not be included in the bill. But, owing in large part to the support of the administration and the influence of the pro-Pakistan lobby, the provision was included in the bill and became law.

As far back as last summer, many of us in Congress—Democrats and Republicans, Members of both bodies—argued that providing these weapons to Pakistan was a bad idea, giving Pakistan's ongoing determinations to develop nu-

clear weapons, its involvement in arming, training, and financing terrorist movements and its often open hostility to Western interests. Last summer, it was reported that Pakistan received Chinese M-11 missiles, in direct violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime. These missiles are capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and can strike cities within a 275-mile radius. It was reported last year that Pakistan developed its nuclear weapons from a blueprint provided by the People's Republic of China, and Pakistan then gave this blueprint to Iran. Pakistan remains an unstable nation, where the military does not seem to be under strong civilian control, a country which supports the embargo of Israel and does not recognize the State of Israel.

Then came the revelations early this year, based on intelligence information, that Pakistan purchased 5,000 ring magnets from the People's Republic of China in late 1994 and early 1995. These ring magnets are used to enrich uranium, a key component for making nuclear weapons. This transfer, which Pakistan has repeatedly denied to the administration and the Congress, is a direct violation of the Glenn-Symington Amendment and the 1994 amendment to the Non-Proliferation Act. When the Senate and the Foreign Ops Conferees considered the Brown amendment, this information was not known. I believe that this information would most certainly have swung a few votes—had it been available.

By way of a little history: during the last decade, Pakistan was the third largest recipient of United States foreign military assistance. Pakistan asked for the help of the United States in becoming conventionally strong militarily and in exchange promised—promised—not to develop or obtain nuclear weapons. By 1985, United States intelligence had strong evidence that Pakistan was receiving United States arms while going back on its word about developing nuclear capability. As a form of leverage, the Congress in 1985 enacted the Pressler amendment, named for its Senate sponsor, requiring an annual Presidential certification that Pakistan does not have a nuclear device. In 1990, with overwhelming evidence of Pakistan's nuclear program, President Bush invoked the Pressler amendment. The United States essentially said: Yes, Pakistan has the bomb. Thus, all U.S. military assistance was ended—including weapons already contracted for and paid for but not delivered. Pakistani officials could not have been surprised, knowing these ramifications when they officially agreed to the enactment of the Pressler amendment in 1985. The only surprises may have been that they got caught and that the full penalty of the law was imposed.

It is important to recognize that Pakistan has not agreed to do anything in exchange for the release of the seized equipment. In 1993, President

Clinton did offer to return all or some of the weapons in the pipeline if Pakistan would agree to cap its nuclear program. Pakistan rejected this offer. In fact, by receiving the ring magnets from China, Pakistan was continuing to act—in defiance of the United States—to further its nuclear ambitions.

Finally, the administration came up with a compromise: While 28 F-16 fighter jets would not be delivered to Pakistan—they already have 40 F-16's—the 368 million dollars' worth of equipment would be delivered with no strings attached.

What we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is ending the ban on providing weapons to Pakistan, and receiving nothing in return.

The delivery of these weapons comes just about a month before the general elections in India, Pakistan's neighbor. Tensions between these two South Asian nations remain high. Pakistan has fought three wars with India during the past 48 years.

Clearly, India will see the delivery of these weapons as a slap in the face. The opposition BJP party in India, which has already gained in strength, is running on a platform promising a much harder line in terms of relations with Pakistan, relations with the United States, and India's own nuclear weapons development program. While this story may be buried on the back pages of American newspapers, I can guarantee you that the delivery of the United States weapons to Pakistan will be page 1 news in India—to the benefit of those forces in Indian society that oppose the recent move toward closer commercial and strategic cooperation between India and the United States. The United States has in the past few years become India's largest trading partner. Why are we jeopardizing this important new economic relationship?

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against improved relations with Pakistan, but I believe this goal should be achieved through economic means. The Government of Pakistan devotes much too large of a share of its scarce resources to the military, to the detriment of the people. If the administration wants to engage Pakistan, let's engage them with more trade and support for democracy building institutions.

Nuclear nonproliferation is and should be a top U.S. foreign policy goal in this post-cold-war world. The Pressler amendment has been a pillar of America's nonproliferation efforts. We should not weaken this law with waivers or loopholes.

Pakistan keeps giving us every reason to keep the Pressler amendment in force.

Mr. Speaker, I will be working with some of my colleagues to enact a resolution of disapproval for this weapons transfer, and I hope we can achieve broad, bipartisan support. Providing these weapons to Pakistan would be a grave error that would threaten the stability of South Asia, international

nuclear nonproliferation and the interests and prestige of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. KELLY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HONORING EUNICE MERRILL, WOMAN OF THE YEAR FOR THE FIFTH DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House tonight to pay tribute to a very special woman from the Fifth District of Alabama. She is Mrs. Eunice Merrill from Huntsville, AL.

Many years ago, at a time when there were very few women in Alabama running their own businesses, Miss Eunice opened Eunice's Country Kitchen.

It is a place where people of all ages and all stations in life gather together. It is truly a crossroads in our community, where everyone can share breakfast and a common table.

The food and the conversation are big attractions, but one of the main reasons people come from all around is Miss Eunice herself.

She treats everyone who walks through her door like they are family, whether they are long-time friends or first-time customers. No matter how early it is or how busy it is, Eunice always has a smile and a kind word for every person.

While she is beloved for her kindness and her hospitality, Miss Eunice is revered for her extraordinary work for charity, especially on behalf of the Arthritis Foundation.

But, last November, Mr. Speaker, tragedy struck Miss Eunice. She was leaving her house for work at 4 o'clock in the morning, as she did most every morning to begin fixing breakfast for her customers.

As she walked from her house to her car, Miss Eunice was brutally attacked and robbed. She was rushed to a hospital to undergo emergency surgery.

Not only did she survive the attack, but after a week's stay in the hospital, at the age of 78, Miss Eunice was back at work.

She didn't even postpone the fundraiser she had organized for the Arthritis Foundation, which she held, just as she planned, on the very first day she returned.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Eunice Merrill is a glowing testament to the heart and strength of the human spirit. While her story of survival is inspiring, it is simply one chapter in a life story of faith and perseverance.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to stand here tonight to honor the Woman of

the Year for the Fifth District of Alabama, Mrs. Eunice Merrill.

MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Medicare program, because we are about to receive the 1996 report from the board of trustees of the Medicare program. It was just a year ago that we received the 1995 report, in April 1995, stating that Medicare was going bankrupt. The report from the board of trustees stated that it was going to be running out of money this year and all the reserves of the Medicare program would be totally exhausted in 7 more years. And the trustees of the Medicare program are basically appointees of the Clinton administration, the Secretary of HHS, Donna Shalala, Secretary of Treasury, Mr. Rubin, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Reich and others. This is a bipartisan report.

The fact is Medicare is going bankrupt. And what I want to talk about today is what has happened since the last report, as we are about to receive the 1996 report.

From my area in Florida, I have a very large number of seniors. In fact I have more seniors in my congressional district than any other congressional district in the United States. It is very important for all the seniors in my district. It is important to me personally. I have an 87-year-old mother who is on Medicare. But it is also important for all the people in my district because of the jobs and the impact on the economy.

Sarasota Memorial Hospital is the second largest employer in Sarasota County in Florida. So it is a jobs issue that is important, to take care of the seniors in my district, and it is something that we need to fight for and save. It is not a political issue. Medicare is too important an issue to be played with as politics.

Well, what did Congress do during the past year about the Medicare program? First of all, we listened. I sent letters out and asked for advice from my constituents and received over 1,000 responses. Members in Congress held over 1,000 town hall meetings all over the United States asking for input and advice, what they should do about the Medicare program. We listened, and we listened well, and got ideas. We came up with a plan.

Two things we found out: One is, Medicare is in crisis; and the other item we learned is, it is full of waste, fraud and abuse. Those are the two things that kept getting repeated time and time again. We have a major problem with the Medicare program. We understand that. We need to do something about it. And it is the waste, fraud and abuse. So what did Congress do?